arXiv:1304.0424v1 [math.AP] 1 Apr 2013

THE TWO PHASE PARABOLIC SIGNORINI PROBLEM

MARK ALLEN AND WENHUI SHI

Abstract. We study solutions to a variational equation that models heat control on the boundary. This problem can be thought of as the two-phase parabolic Signorini problem. Specifically, we study variational solutions to the equation

$$\int_{Q^+} u'(t)(w-u) + \langle \nabla u(t), \nabla (w-u)\rangle$$
$$+ \int_{Q'} \lambda_+(w^+ - u^+) + \lambda_-(w^- - u^-)\; d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} dt \geq 0$$

without any sign restriction on the function u. We show that when the solution u has a sign on Q', then u is a solution to the parabolic Signorini problem modulo a linear factor. The main result states that the two free boundaries

$$\Gamma^+ = \partial\{u(\,\cdot\,,0,t) > 0\} \text{ and } \Gamma^- = \partial\{u(\,\cdot\,,0,t) < 0\}$$

cannot touch. i.e. $\Gamma^+ \cap \Gamma^- = \emptyset$ therefore reducing the study of the free boundary to the parabolic Signorini problem. The separation also allows us to show the optimal regularity of the solutions.

1. Introduction

In this paper we study what can be termed the "two phase parabolic Signorini problem". To formulate this problem we first consider a smooth domain Ω in $\mathbb{R}^n$ that is even with respect to the x_n variable. We denote the several pieces of the parabolic cylinder by

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^+ &:= \{x \in \Omega \mid x_n > 0\} \\ \Omega^+_T &:= \Omega^+ \times (0,T] \\ \Omega' &:= \Omega \cap (\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\}) \\ \Omega'_T &:= \Omega' \times (0,T] \end{aligned}$$

The variational formulation of this problem is given by finding a solution u with $u(\,\cdot\,,0) = \phi_0$ and $u = g$ on $(\partial\Omega)^+ \times (0,T]$ to the variational inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega^+_T} u'(t)(w-u) + \langle \nabla u(t), \nabla(w-u)\rangle \\ &+ \int_{\Omega'_T} \lambda_+(w^+ - u^+) + \lambda_-(w^- - u^-)\; d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\, dt \geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

for every $w \in \mathcal{R}_g = \{w \in W^{1,0}_2(\Omega_T) \mid w = g \text{ on } (\partial\Omega)^+ \times (0,T]\}$. Throughout the paper $\lambda_\pm > 0$.

This problem arises as a limiting case in modeling heat control on the boundary. Specifically, consider the problem of fixing the temperature on one portion of the boundary $\partial\Omega^+$ (for instance $(\partial\Omega)^+$). On Ω' (the other portion of $\partial\Omega^+$) we seek

---

M. Allen and W. Shi are supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1101139.

to maintain the temperature in the fixed interval $[h_1, h_2]$. If the temperature rises above h_2 or below h_1 at $x \in \Omega'$, we cool or heat the domain by injecting a fixed quantity of heat at x. Our problem formulated in (1.1) corresponds to the limiting case when $h_1 = h_2$. If the temperature on Ω' drops above or below a fixed constant temperature a fixed quantity of heat is injected. For more information on the modeling of the problem see the book [7]. There are several relevant reasons for studying the specific limiting case in which $h_1 = h_2$. The problem in (1.1) can be seen as the "thin" version of the two phase parabolic obstacle problem which is formulated by replacing the domains of integration Ω_T' and Ω_T^+ in (1.1) with the solid cylinder Ω_T. The two phase parabolic obstacle problem arises as a limiting case for a model for heat control regulated through the interior of the domain [7]. Then in both mathematical formulation and application, (1.1) can be considered the "parabolic two phase thin obstacle problem". We can also illustrate the connection between this two phase thin obstacle problem and the one phase thin obstacle problem which is also commonly referred to as the Signorini problem. The (zero obstacle) Signorini problem has the variational formulation

$$\int_{\Omega_T^+} u'(t)(w-u) + \langle \nabla u(t), \nabla(w-u)\rangle \geq 0 \tag{1.2}$$

for every $w \in \{w \in W_2^{1,0}(\Omega_T^+) \mid w = g \text{ on } (\partial\Omega)^+ \times (0,T] \text{ and } w \geq 0 \text{ on } \Omega_T'\}$.

We have the following

Proposition 1.1. *Let u be a solution to (1.1) such that $u \geq 0 \quad (\leq 0)$ on Ω_T'. Then $u - \lambda_+ x_n \quad (-u - \lambda_- x_n)$ is a solution to (1.2)*

Proof. Let u be a solution to (1.1). Without loss of generality we assume $u \geq 0$ on Ω_T'. Assume $w = u - \lambda_+ x_n$ on $(\partial\Omega)^+ \times (0,T]$ and $w \geq 0$ on Ω_T'. Then define $v := w + \lambda_+ x_n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega_T^+} \partial_t(u-\lambda_+x_n)(w-u+\lambda_+x_n) + \langle \nabla(u-\lambda_+x_n), \nabla(w-u+\lambda_+x_n)\rangle \\
&= \int_{\Omega_T^+} \partial_t u(v-\lambda_+x_n-u+\lambda_+x_n) + \langle \nabla(u-\lambda_+x_n), \nabla(v-\lambda_+x_n-u+\lambda_+x_n)\rangle \\
&= \int_{\Omega_T^+} u'(t)(v-u) + \langle \nabla u, \nabla(v-u)\rangle - \lambda_+\partial_{x_n}(v-u) \\
&= \int_{\Omega_T^+} u'(t)(v-u) + \langle \nabla u, \nabla(v-u)\rangle + \int_{Q'} \lambda_+ v - \lambda_+ u \\
&= \int_{\Omega_T^+} u'(t)(v-u) + \langle \nabla u, \nabla(v-u)\rangle + \int_{Q'} \lambda_+ v^+ - \lambda_+ u^+ \geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality is true because $u, v \geq 0$ on Ω_T' by hypothesis. The case in which $u \leq 0$ on Ω_T' is proven similarly. □

One may very well ask about the other direction. If v is a solution to (1.2) is $u := v + \lambda_+ x_n^+$ a solution to (1.1)? If v is a solution to (1.2), then $\nabla v \in H^{\alpha,\alpha/2}$ [10, 6]. It then follows that one may choose λ_+ large enough so that $v + \lambda_+ x_n^+ \geq 0$ in a local parabolic neighborhood Q_r^+. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
u_{x_n}(x',0,t) &= \lambda_+ && \text{if } u(x',0,t) > 0 \\
0 \leq u_{x_n}(x',0,t) &\leq \lambda_+ && \text{if } u(x',0,t) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

It then follows that $u = v + \lambda_+ x_n$ is a solution to (1.1) in Q_r^+.

When considering the temperature control in the interval $[h_1, h_2]$, an important aspect in the study of these problems relates to the free boundaries

$$\Gamma_{h_2}^+ := \partial\{u(x', 0, t) > h_2\} \qquad \Gamma_{h_1}^- := \partial\{u(x', 0, t) < h_1\}$$

When $h_1 < h_2$ the continuity of solutions follows from the penalization method used in Section 3. It is then clear from continuity of solutions that the two free boundaries cannot intersect, i.e. $\Gamma_{h_2}^+ \cap \Gamma_{h_1}^- = \emptyset$. One may ask if this separation is preserved in the limiting case when $h_1 = h_2$. When the phases separate, one may reduce the study of the free boundaries in (1.1) to the study of the free boundary in the parabolic Signorini problem since addition of $\mp\lambda_\pm x_n$ leaves the free boundary invariant. The main question therefore becomes: is $\Gamma_0^+ \cap \Gamma_0^- = \emptyset$? (Here $\Gamma^\pm := \Gamma_0^\pm$.)

Recently, the elliptic (time-independent) version of this problem was studied in [1]. The authors in [1] showed that indeed the separation $\Gamma^+ \cap \Gamma^-$ is preserved in the limiting case. The main result in this paper is the parabolic analogue

Theorem 1.2. *Let u be a solution to* (1.1) *in Ω_T. Then $\Gamma^+ \cap \Gamma^- \cap \{t > 0\} = \emptyset$.*

The above theorem states that even if the positivity and negativity sets in touch in Q_T', there is an immediate separation for time $t > 0$. As previously noted, the separation of the free boundaries makes the problem locally equivalent to the parabolic Signorini problem. Therefore, as corollaries to Theorem 1.2 we obtain the optimal regularity (Corollary 5.6) of the solutions to (1.1) as well as regularity results for the free boundaries.

The outline of this paper is as follows.

- In section 2 we provide the notation that will be used throughout the paper. We also include a few preliminary results.
- In section 3 we prove the Hölder and Lipschitz regularity of solutions as well as the existence of solutions.
- In section 4 we prove a nondegeneracy estimate that states that solutions must grow by a certain factor away from free boundary points.
- In section 5 we use the results from the previous sections in combination with a monotonicity formula to provide a simple proof of Theorem 1.2. We also state as a consequence results involving the optimal regularity and the free boundary.

2. Notation and Preliminaries

Since the results in this paper are local in nature, for simplicity we will work over Euclidean balls and parabolic cylinders centered on the thin space $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\}$. We will follow the notation used in [6]. For a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we denote $x = (x', x_n)$

where $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$. For $r > 0$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ we let

$$\begin{array}{lll}
B_r(x_0) & = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |x| < r\} & \text{(Euclidean ball)} \\
B_r^{\pm}(x_0) & = B_r(x_0) \cap \mathbb{R}^n_{\pm} & \text{(Euclidean halfball)} \\
B'_r(x_0) & = B_r(x) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-1} & \text{(``thin'' ball)} \\
Q_r(x_0, t_0) & = B_r(x_0) \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0]\ t_0 \in \mathbb{R} & \text{(parabolic cylinder)} \\
Q'_r(x_0, t_0) & = B'_r(x_0) \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0] & \text{(``thin'' parabolic cylinder)} \\
Q_r^{\pm}(x_0, t_0) & = B_r^{\pm}(x_0) \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0] & \text{(parabolic halfcylinders)} \\
\widetilde{Q}_r(x_0, t_0) & = B_r(x_0) \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0 + r^2) & \text{(full parabolic cylinder)} \\
\widetilde{Q}'_r(x_0, t_0) & = B'_r(x_0) \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0 + r^2) & \text{(full ``thin'' parabolic cylinder)}
\end{array}$$

For simplicity we write Q, Q^+ and Q' instead if the center is on $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}$ and the radius is not specified.

For a general domain $\Omega_T = \Omega \times (0, T]$, $\partial_p \Omega_T = (\partial\Omega \times (0, T]) \cup (\Omega \times \{0\})$ is the parabolic boundary. For $(x, t), (y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $d_p((x, t), (y, s)) = \max\{|x - y|, |t - s|^{1/2}\}$ is the parabolic distance; $d_p(E_1, E_2) = \inf_{(x,t)\in E_1, (y,s)\in E_2} d_p((x, t), (y, s))$ is the parabolic distance between two subsets $E_1, E_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

The parabolic Sobolev spaces $W_q^{2m,m}(\Omega_T)$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, are the Banach spaces of functions with a generalized derivative $\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j u \in L_q(\Omega_T)$ for $|\alpha| + 2j \le 2m$ and the norm

$$\|u\|_{W_q^{2m,m}(\Omega_T)} = \sum_{|\alpha|+2j\le 2m} \|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j u\|_{L_q(\Omega_T)}.$$

Parabolic Sobolev spaces $W_q^{1,0}(\Omega_T)$, $W_q^{1,1}(\Omega_T)$ are the Banach spaces with the norms

$$\|u\|_{W_q^{1,0}(\Omega_T)} = \|u\|_{L_q(\Omega_T)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_q(\Omega_T)}$$
$$\|u\|_{W_q^{1,1}(\Omega_T)} = \|u\|_{L_q(\Omega_T)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_q(\Omega_T)} + \|\partial_t u\|_{L_q(\Omega_T)}.$$

Parabolic Hölder spaces $H^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\Omega_T)$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ is the set of continuous functions which are Hölder-α in space and Hölder-$\alpha/2$ in time.

We denote the free boundaries of a solution u to (1.1) by

$$\Gamma^+ = \partial\{u(x', 0, t) > 0\} \qquad \Gamma^- = \partial\{u(x', 0, t) < 0\}$$

The boundary here is in the sense of the topology of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}$.

Since our solutions are defined on the half cylinder Q^+ we may evenly reflect with respect to the x_n variable to obtain a function on Q. Whenever a solution u is considered on Q we mean that u is defined by even reflection unless otherwise specified. This evenly reflected u will satisfy (1.1) with Q^+ replaced by Q and $\lambda_\pm$ replaced by $2\lambda_\pm$. Sometimes it will be more convenient to work over Q.

The following rescaling property of solutions combined with the translation invariance of our equation in the x' and t variables will allow us to assume without loss of generality in proving most of our results that our cylinder is $Q_1(0, 0)$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let u be a solution to* (1.1) *in* $Q_1(0, 0)$. *Define*

$$u_r(x, t) := \frac{u(rx, r^2 t)}{r}$$

Then u_r is a solution in $Q_{1/r}(0, 0)$.

It is clear from the variational equation that

Proposition 2.2. *Let u be a solution to* (1.1) *on Q^+. Then*

$$\partial_t u(x,t) - \Delta u(x,t) = 0$$

for all $(x,t) \in Q^+$. Also if $u > 0$ ($u < 0$) in a neighborhood Q of $(x', 0, t)$, then

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_n} = \lambda_+ \quad (-\lambda_-) \text{ on } Q' \tag{2.1}$$

Remark 2.3. (2.1) follows from the continuity of solutions which is proved in the next section.

Proposition 2.4 (Uniqueness)**.** *Let u_1, u_2 be two solutions to* (1.1) *with $u_1 = u_2$ on $(\partial_p Q_1)^+$. Then $u_1 \equiv u_2$.*

Proof. Since u_i are both solutions with the same boundary data we obtain for $-1 < s \leq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{B_1^+ \times [-1,s]} u_1'(t)(u_2 - u_1) + \langle \nabla u_1, \nabla(u_2 - u_1)\rangle \\ &+ \int_{B_1' \times [-1,s]} \lambda_+(u_2^+ - u_1^+) + \lambda_-(u_2^- - u_1^-)\, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}dt \geq 0\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{B_1^+ \times [-1,s]} u_2'(t)(u_1 - u_2) + \langle \nabla u_2, \nabla(u_1 - u_2)\rangle \\ &+ \int_{B_1' \times [-1,s]} \lambda_+(u_1^+ - u_2^+) + \lambda_-(u_1^- - u_2^-)\, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}dt \geq 0\end{aligned}$$

we add the two inequalities above to obtain

$$-\int_{B_1^+} \int_{-1}^{s} \left[\frac{1}{2}(u_1 - u_2)^2\right]' \geq \int_{B_1^+ \times [-1,s]} \|\nabla(u_1 - u_2)\|^2 \geq 0$$

since $u_1 = u_2$ on $B_1^+ \times \{-1\}$ we obtain

$$\int_{B_1^+ \times \{s\}} (u_1 - u_2)^2 \leq 0$$

This holds for any $-1 < s \leq 0$, so $u_1 \equiv u_2$. □

3. Existence and Lipschitz regularity

In this section we prove the existence of the solution to the variational inequality (1.1) and its local Lipschitz continuity. For simplicity we show it for $Q_1^+ \cup Q_1'$.

Given

$$g \in W_2^{2,1}(Q_1^+), \partial_t g \in W_2^{1,0}(Q_1^+), f \in L_2(Q_1^+) \text{ and } \varphi_0 \in W_2^1(B_1^+), \tag{3.1}$$

where g and φ_0 satisfy the compatibility condition on $B_1^+ \times \{-1\}$, we want to find a function $u \in W_2^{1,1}(Q_1^+)$, such that u solves the variational inequality

$$\int_{Q_1^+} \partial_t u(v-u) + \nabla u \cdot \nabla(v-u) + f(v-u) + \int_{Q_1'} \psi(v) - \psi(u) \geq 0 \text{ for any } v \in \mathcal{R}_g, \tag{3.2}$$

$$u = g \text{ a.e. on } (\partial B_1)^+ \times (-1, 0), \quad u(\cdot, -1) = \varphi_0 \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_g := \{v \in W_2^{1,0}(Q_1^+) : v = g \text{ a.e. on } (\partial B_1)^+ \times (-1,0]\},$$

and ψ is a nonnegative, convex function defined as follows: for $-\lambda_- < 0 < \lambda_+$

$$\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \psi(s) = \begin{cases} \lambda_+ s & \text{if } s > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } s = 0 \\ -\lambda_- s & \text{if } s < 0 \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

Existence and rough regularity of u can be obtained by penalization method. For $\epsilon > 0$, we consider the approximation problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u_\epsilon - \partial_t u_\epsilon = f &\text{ in } Q_1^+ \\ \partial_{x_n} u_\epsilon = \beta_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) &\text{ on } Q_1' \\ u_\epsilon = g &\text{ on } (\partial B_1)^+ \times (-1,0] \\ u_\epsilon = u &\text{ on } B_1^+ \times \{-1\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the penalty function $\beta_\epsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, such that

$$\beta_\epsilon(s) = \lambda_+ \text{ if } s \geq \epsilon; \quad \beta_\epsilon(s) = -\lambda_- \text{ if } s \leq -\epsilon; \quad \beta_\epsilon'(s) \geq 0; \quad \beta_\epsilon(0) = 0.$$

The variational solution to the approximation problem exists [8] and $u_\epsilon \in W_2^{2,1}(Q_1^+)$ with norms possibly depending on ϵ. Now we show u_ϵ are uniformly bounded in $W_2^{1,1}(Q_1^+)$. To this end, we consider the variational equation

$$\int_{B_1^+ \times (t_1,t_2]} (\nabla u_\epsilon \cdot \nabla \eta + \partial_t u_\epsilon \eta + f\eta) + \int_{B_1' \times (t_1,t_2]} \beta_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)\eta = 0 \tag{3.5}$$

for any $\eta \in W_2^{1,0}(Q_1^+)$ vanishing a.e. on $(\partial B_1)^+ \times (-1,0]$ and $(t_1,t_2] \subset (-1,0]$.

Plugging in $\eta = u_\epsilon - g$ in (3.5) and using the fact that $\beta_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)u_\epsilon \geq 0$ a.e., we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{t \in (-1,0]} \|u_\epsilon(\cdot,t)\|^2_{L_2(B_1^+)} + \|\nabla u_\epsilon\|^2_{L_2(Q_1^+)} \\ &\qquad \leq C_n \left(\|\varphi_0\|^2_{L_2(B_1^+)} + \|g\|_{W_2^{2,1}(Q_1^+)} + \|f\|_{L_2(Q_1^+)} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Plugging in $\eta = \partial_t(u_\epsilon - g)$ in (3.5) and using the fact that $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(s) \geq 0$, where $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon' = \beta_\epsilon$ with $\mathcal{B}(0) = 0$ is an approximation of ψ, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{t \in (-1,0]} \|\nabla u_\epsilon(\cdot,t)\|^2_{L_2(B_1^+)} + \|\partial_t u_\epsilon\|^2_{L_2(Q_1^+)} \\ &\quad \leq C_{n,\lambda_\pm} \left(\|\nabla \varphi_0\|^2_{L_2(B_1^+)} + \|\partial_t g\|_{W_2^{1,0}(Q_1^+)} + \|\partial_t g\|_{L_2(Q_1')} + \|f\|_{L_2(Q_1^+)} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Thus, u_ϵ is uniformly bounded in $W_2^{1,1}(Q_1^+)$.

Lemma 3.1 (Existence)**.** *Let g, f and φ_0 satisfy the condition* (3.1)*, then there exists a solution u to* (3.2) *and* (3.3)*.*

Proof. Let u_ϵ be the solution to the penalized problem, then from the arguments above, u_ϵ is uniformly bounded in $W_2^{1,1}(Q_1^+)$ and satisfies (3.6) and (3.7).

Up to a subsequence $\epsilon_j \to 0$, $u_{\epsilon_j} \rightharpoonup u$ in $W_2^{1,1}(Q_1^+)$ and $u_{\epsilon_j} \to u$ in $L_2(Q_1^+)$. We claim u satisfies (3.2). To show this, we take $\eta = v - u_{\epsilon_j}$ in (3.5) with $v \in \mathcal{R}_g$, then due to the fact that $\beta_\epsilon'(s) \geq 0$ we have

$$\int_{Q_1^+} \partial_t u_{\epsilon_j}(v - u_{\epsilon_j}) + \nabla u_{\epsilon_j} \cdot \nabla(v - u_{\epsilon_j}) + f(v - u_{\epsilon_j}) + \int_{Q_1'} \mathcal{B}_{\epsilon_j}(v) - \mathcal{B}_{\epsilon_j}(u_{\epsilon_j}) \geq 0, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{R}_g.$$

We notice that $|\mathcal{B}_{\epsilon_j}(s) - \psi(s)| \le \lambda_\pm s \chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}$ for ψ as in (3.4) and $u_{\epsilon_j} \to v$ in $L_2(Q_1')$ by the trace theorem (e.g. I.5.3 in [7]). Then passing to the limit $\epsilon_j \to 0$ and arguing as in section 5.6.1 in [7], we obtain the existence of solutions for (3.2). The boundary condition (3.3) follows from the trace theorem.

□

Next we show some uniform local estimates for u_ϵ. First by plugging in $\eta = \partial_{x_i}[(\partial_{x_i}u_\epsilon)\xi^2]$, $i = 1, \cdots, n-1$, $\xi \in C_0^\infty(B_1^+ \cup B_1')$, and using the monotonicity of β_ϵ, we get

(3.8)
$$\|\partial^2_{x_ix_j}u_\epsilon\|_{L_2(Q_r^+)} \le C_{n,r}\left(\|\varphi_0\|_{W^{1,2}(B_1^+)} + \|\partial_t g\|_{W_2^{1,0}(Q_1^+)} + \|\partial_t g\|_{L_2(Q_1')} + \|f\|_{L_2(Q_1^+)}\right)$$

for $i = 1, \cdots, n$, $j = 1, \cdots, n-1$. By using the equation, (3.8) and the estimate for $\partial_t u_\epsilon$ we get a similar estimate as (3.8) for $\partial_{x_nx_n}u_\epsilon$.

Let $w_{\epsilon,i} = \partial_{x_i}u_\epsilon$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Then by (3.7) and (3.8) $w_{\epsilon,i} \in W_2^{1,0}(Q_r^+)$. Moreover, we have

$$\|w_{\epsilon,i}\|_{W_2^{1,0}(Q_r^+)} + \sup_{t\in(-1,0]}\|w_{\epsilon,i}(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(Q_1^+)} \le C(n, r, \lambda_\pm, \varphi_0, g, f).$$

Now we assume that $f \in L_\infty(Q_1^+)$. It is not hard to see that $w_{\epsilon,i}$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n-1$ are weak solutions of

$$\Delta w_{\epsilon,i} - \partial_t w_{\epsilon,i} = \partial_{x_i} f \text{ in } Q_r^+, \quad \partial_{x_n} w_{\epsilon,i} = \beta_\epsilon'(u_\epsilon)w_{\epsilon,i} \text{ on } Q_r' \tag{3.9}$$

and a weak solution of

$$\Delta w_{\epsilon,i} - \partial_t w_{\epsilon,i} = \partial_{x_n} f \text{ in } Q_r^+, \quad w_{\epsilon,i} = \beta_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) \text{ on } Q_r', \tag{3.10}$$

if $i = n$.

Since $\beta_\epsilon'(u_\epsilon) \ge 0$ in (3.9), then applying the local L_∞ estimate for the conormal problem (Theorem 6.41 in [9]) to $w_{\epsilon,i}^+$ and $w_{\epsilon,i}^-$ seperately we obtain

$$\sup_{Q_r^+\cup Q_r'} |w_{\epsilon,i}| \le C_{n,r}\|w_{\epsilon,i}\|_{L_2(Q_{2r}^+)} \le C(n, r, \lambda_\pm, \varphi_0, g, f), \quad i = 1, \cdots, n-1$$

To estimate $w_{\epsilon,n}$, we notice that $|\beta_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)| \le \max\{\lambda_+, \lambda_-\}$. Hence by the boundary estimates (Theorem 6.30 in [9]) we obtain

$$\sup_{Q_r^+\cup Q_r'} |w_{\epsilon,n}| \le C_{n,r,\lambda_\pm}(\|w_{\epsilon,n}\|_{L_2(Q_{2r}^+)} + \|f\|_{L_\infty(Q_1^+)}) \le C(n, r, \lambda_\pm, \varphi_0, g, f).$$

Thus, ∇u_ϵ is uniformly bounded in $L_\infty(Q_r^+ \cup Q_r')$.

To show Hölder 1/2 in t, we use the maximum principle argument of Gilding, which for Dirichlet boundary datum can be found in Chapter II of [9].

Assume $\|\nabla u_\epsilon\|_{L_\infty(Q_r^+)} \le L$. Let

$$\widehat{Q} = B_R(x_0) \times (t_0, t_0 + R^2/4n), \widehat{Q}' = B_R'(x_0) \times (t_0, t_0 + R^2/4n), \widehat{Q}^+ = \widehat{Q} \cap \{x_n > 0\},$$

where $(x_0, t_0) \in \{x_n = 0\}$, $0 < R < r$. We consider

$$v_\epsilon^\pm = \left(\sup_{\widehat{Q}^+}|f| + \frac{2sn}{R^2}\right)(t - t_0) + \frac{s}{R^2}|x - x_0|^2 + (L + \Lambda)R \pm (u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon(x_0, t_0)) - \Lambda x_n,$$

where

$$s = \sup_{t\in(t_0,t_0+R^2/4n)} |u_\epsilon(x_0, t) - u_\epsilon(x_0, t_0)|, \quad \Lambda = \max\{\lambda_+, \lambda_-\}.$$

It is not hard to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta v_\epsilon^\pm - \partial_t v_\epsilon^\pm \le 0 \text{ in } \widehat{Q}^+, \\ \partial_{x_n} v_\epsilon^\pm \le 0 \text{ on } \widehat{Q}', \\ v_\epsilon^\pm \ge 0 \text{ on } \partial_p \widehat{Q} \cap \{x_n \ge 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by maximum principle we have $v_\epsilon^\pm \ge 0$ in $\widehat{Q}^+$. Evaluating the inequality at $x = x_0$ and taking the supremum over all t gives

$$s \le \left(\sup_{\widehat{Q}^+} |f| + \frac{2sn}{R^2} \right) \frac{R^2}{4n} + (L + \Lambda) R,$$

which yields

$$s \le \sup_{\widehat{Q}^+} |f| \frac{R^2}{2n} + (L + \Lambda) R. \tag{3.11}$$

Now let $R = (t_1 - t_0)^{1/2}$, where $t_1 \in (t_0, t_0 + r^2)$. Then (3.11) implies

$$|u_\epsilon(x_0, t_1) - u_\epsilon(x_0, t_0)| \le C(n, f, \Lambda, L) |t_1 - t_0|^{1/2}, \quad x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}.$$

Then by a standard argument using the representation formula for the heat equation (see chapter IV in [8]), one can show that u_ϵ is uniform Hölder 1/2 in t in Q_r^+ for $r \in (0, 1)$.

We summarize the estimates above in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2 (Interior regularity)**.** *Let $u \in W_2^{1,1}(Q_1^+)$ satisfy* (3.2) *and* (3.3) *with $g \in W_2^{2,1}(\overline{Q_1^+})$, $\partial_t g \in W_2^{1,0}(Q_1^+)$, $f \in L_\infty(Q_1^+)$ and $\varphi_0 \in W_2^1(B_1^+)$. Then $u \in W_2^{2,1}(Q_r^+)$ and $u \in H^{1,1/2}(Q_r^+ \cup Q_r')$ for $r \in (0, 1)$. More precisely,*

$$\|u\|_{W_2^{2,1}(Q_r^+)} \le C_{n,r} (\|\varphi_0\|_{W^{1,2}(B_1^+)} + \|\partial_t g\|_{W_2^{1,0}(Q_1^+)} + \|\partial_t g\|_{L_2(Q_1')} + \|f\|_{L_2(Q_1^+)}),$$

and

$$\|u\|_{H^{1,1/2}(Q_r^+ \cup Q_r')} \le C(n, r, \lambda_\pm, \varphi_0, g, f).$$

From the regularity we obtain the immediate corollaries

Corollary 3.3. *For a domain Ω, let u_k be a sequence of solutions to* (1.1) *on Ω_T. Let $D \Subset \Omega$. Assume that*

$$\|u_k\|_{H^{1,1/2}(\Omega_T^+ \cup Omega_T')} \le C$$

then there exists a convergent subsequence $u_k \to u_0$ such that

(1) $u_k \rightharpoonup u_0$ *in* $H^{1,1/2}(\Omega_T)$

(2) $u_k \to u_0$ *in* $H^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{D}_T)$ *for every* $\alpha < 1$

(3) $u_0 \in H^{1,1/2}(\Omega_T)$ *and* u_0 *is a solution to* (1.1) *in* D_T

This next corollary will provide us with the existence of so called “blow-ups”.

Corollary 3.4. *Let u be a solution to* (1.1) *with $u(0, 0) = 0$. Let u_r be defined as in Proposition 2.1. Then there exists a subsequence $u_{r_k} \to u_0$ such that*

(1) $u_0 \in H^{1,1/2}(Q_R)$ *for every* $R > 0$

(2) u_0 *is a solution to* (1.1) *in* Q_R *for every* $R > 0$

4. Nondegeneracy

This section is devoted to proving a nondegeneracy property. This result states that the sup (inf) of a solution must grow linearly from a free boundary point of Γ^+ (Γ^-). In this section it will be convenient to work with the solution over all of Q obtained by even reflection.

We begin with the following comparison principle.

Proposition 4.1 (Comparison Principle)**.** *Let u, v be two solutions with $u \leq v$ on $\partial_p Q$. Then $u \leq v$ in Q.*

Proof. Let $D := \{(x,t) \in Q \mid x_n > 0 \text{ and } u > v\}$, which is open by the continuity of u and v. Assume it is not empty. We note that u, v are solutions over D that share the same boundary data on $(\partial D \cap \{t < 0\})^+$. Although D is not a cylinder, the same method employed in proving Proposition 2.4 may be used to show $u = v$ on D, which is a contradiction. Then $u \leq v$.

□

Lemma 4.2. *There exists $\epsilon > 0$ depending only on $\lambda_\pm$ and n such that if u_ϵ is the solution with constant boundary data ϵ on $\partial_p Q_1$, then*

$$u_\epsilon(x', 0, t) = 0 \quad \text{for all } (x', 0, t) \in Q'_{1/2}$$

Proof. Suppose by way of contradiction that there exists $\epsilon_k \to 0$ and points $(x'_k, 0, t_k) \in Q'_{1/2}$ such that

$$u_{\epsilon_k}(x'_k, 0, t_k) > 0$$

By Proposition 4.1 since $u_\epsilon = \epsilon$ on $\partial_p Q_1$, then $u_\epsilon \geq 0$ in Q_1. Then $u_\epsilon - \lambda_+ x_n^+$ is a solution to the parabolic Signorini problem on Q_1^+. Then by $H^{\alpha,\alpha/2}$ estimates in $Q_{3/4}$ for $\nabla(u_\epsilon - \lambda_+ x_n^+)$ [6] independent of ϵ, we obtain that $u_\epsilon \to u_0$ and $\nabla u_\epsilon \to \nabla u_0 = 0$ in $H^{\alpha,\alpha/2}$ in $Q_{3/4}$ for $\alpha < 1/2$. But

$$\partial_{x_n} u_{\epsilon_k}(x'_k, 0, t_k) = \lambda_+$$

and for a subsequence $(x'_k, 0, t_k) \to (x'_0, 0, t_0) \in \overline{Q'}_{1/2}$, so that

$$\partial_{x_n} u_0(x'_0, 0, t_0) = \lambda_+$$

which is a contradiction since $u_0 \equiv 0$. □

Theorem 4.3 (Nondegeneracy)**.** *Let u be a variational solution to* (1.1)*. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ with ϵ depending only on $\lambda_\pm$ and n such that if $u|_{\partial_p Q_r} \leq \epsilon r$ ($u|_{\partial_p Q_r} \geq -\epsilon r$) then*

$$u(x) \leq 0 \quad (u(x) \geq 0) \qquad \text{for } x \in Q'_{r/2}$$

Proof. First we note that by rescaling we only need to prove Theorem 4.3 on Q_1. By Lemma 4.2 $u_\epsilon = 0$ in $Q'_{1/2}$ for ϵ sufficiently small. By Proposition 4.1 if $u \leq \epsilon$ on ∂Q_1, then $u \leq u_\epsilon$. The case for which $u \geq -\epsilon$ is proven similarly. □

From Theorem 4.3 we immediately obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 4.4. *If u is a solution and $0 \in \Gamma^+$ ($0 \in \Gamma^-$), then*

$$\sup_{\partial_p Q_r} u \geq Cr \qquad \left(\inf_{\partial_p Q_r} u \leq -Cr\right) \tag{4.1}$$

Where C depends only on λ_+, λ_- and n.

Remark 4.5. All of the results in this Section may be restated with Q_r replaced by the full cylinder $\widetilde{Q}_r$. The proofs will be identical.

5. The Separation

We begin this section by stating a monotonicity formula for parabolic equations that first appeared in [4]. Let

$$G(x,t) := \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{n/2}} e^{-|x|^2/4t} \text{ for } (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,\infty)$$

be the heat kernel. Then for a function v and any $t > 0$ define

$$I(t,v) = \int_{-t}^{0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla v(x,s)|^2 G(x,-s) dx ds$$

Theorem 5.1. *Let u_1 and u_2 satisfy the following conditions in the strip $\mathbb{R}^n \times [-1,0)$*

$$(a) \quad \Delta u_i - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u_i \geq 0$$
$$(b) \quad u_1 \cdot u_2 = 0$$
$$(c) \quad u_1(0,0) = u_2(0,0) = 0$$

Assume also that the u_i have moderate growth at infinity, for instance

$$\int_{B_R} u_i^2(x,-1)\ dx \leq C e^{\frac{|x|^2}{4+\epsilon}}$$

For R large and some $\epsilon > 0$. Then

$$\Phi(t; u_1, u_2) := \frac{1}{t^2} I(t; u_1) I(t; u_2)$$

is monotone increasing for $0 < t \leq 1$.

Remark 5.2. If u_r is defined as in Proposition 2.1, then

$$\Phi(tr^2; u_1, u_2) = \Phi(t; (u_1)_r, (u_2)_r)$$

We will also utilize the case of equality for the formula in Theorem 5.1.

Proposition 5.3. *Let u_1, u_2 satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 5.1. Then $\phi(t; u_1, u_2)$ is constant if and only if the u_i are two complementary linear functions, i.e., after a rotation $u_1 = \alpha x_n^+$ and $u_2 = \beta x_n^-$ where $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ are constants.*

Proof. The case of equality is determined by replacing all the inequalities with equalities in the proof of Theorem 5.1. The fundamental inequality in the proof of Theorem 5.1 relies on a convexity property of eigenvalues. By a result of Beckner-Kenig-Pipher [3], equality is achieved in that instance when u_1 and u_2 are two complementary half planes passing through the origin (see discussion in [5]). Thus if $\phi(t; u_1, u_2)$ is constant, then on each time slice $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{-s\}$, u_i are two complementary linear functions. In the case of equality, each u_i will also solve the heat equation when positive. Then each u_i is time independent, and the u_i are therefore two complementary linear functions. □

We now proceed with the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.2. Let u be a solution to (1.1) in Q_1^+. As discussed in Section 2, we may evenly reflect u across the thin space $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\}$ and consider the solution in all of Q. Suppose by way of contradiction that there exists a point $(x_0', 0, t_0) \in \Gamma^+ \cap \Gamma^-$ with $t > -1$. Since our solutions are translation invariant in the x' and t variables, we may translate our solution, so that $(0,0,0) \in \Gamma^+ \cap \Gamma^-$. If before translating our solution, $t_0 < 0$, we will use the results from Sections 3 and 4 as stated for $\widetilde{Q}$ and the estimates that follow will be over $\widetilde{Q}$. If $t_0 = 0$ we will use the same results as stated for Q and the estimates that follow would be stated for Q. We then proceed with the so called "blow-up" procedure. We consider the rescalings u_r as defined in Proposition 2.1. By Corollary 3.4 we obtain a subsequence $u_r \to u_0$ where u_0 is a solution to (1.1) on every compact set. We will relabel $u_0 = v$. By Corollary 4.4 and Remark 4.5

$$\sup_{\partial_p \widetilde{Q}_R} u \geq CR \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\partial_p \widetilde{Q}_R} u \leq -CR \tag{5.1}$$

for small R. Then in the limit, (5.1) will also hold for v for every $0 < R < \infty$. Also by Lemma 3.2 and Corollary 3.4 we have

$$|v(x,t)| \leq C(|x| + |t|^{1/2}). \tag{5.2}$$

$v^{\pm}$ will satisfy the hypotheses for Theorem 5.1. Next we perform a blow-up on v. That is we consider the rescalings of v with again $r \to 0$ and obtain a convergent subsequence $v_r \to v_0$. v_0 will be a solution to (1.1) on every compact set and (5.1) will hold for v_0. By Theorem 5.1

$$\Phi(t, v^+, v^-)$$

is monotone increasing for $0 < t \leq 1$. Then $\Phi(0+, v^+, v^-)$ is well defined and finite. By Remark 5.2 we note that for $0 < t \leq 1$

$$\Phi(t, v_0^+, v_0^-) = \lim_{r \to 0} \Phi(t, v_r^+, v_r^-) = \lim_{r \to 0} \Phi(tr^2, v^+, v^-) = \Phi(0+, v^+, v^-).$$

Thus $\Phi(t, v_0^+, v_0^-)$ is constant. By Proposition 5.3 we conclude that $v_0^{\pm}$ are complementary linear functions. Since v_0 is even in the x_n variable and $v_0(x', 0, t)$ satisfies (2.1) when $v(x', 0, t) \neq 0$, it follows that $v_0 = c|x_n|$ for $t \leq 0$.

If before translating our solution, $(x_0', 0, t_0) \in \Gamma^+ \cap \Gamma^-$ was such that $t_0 < 0$, we must also show $v_0 = c|x_n|$ for $t > 0$. Since v_0 is a solution to (1.1) it follows that $-\lambda_- \leq c \leq \lambda_+$. Consider $w_1 = (v_0 - c|x_n|)^+$ and $w_2 = -(v_0 - c|x_n|)^-$. Now $v_0 + c|x_n|$ is a solution to the heat equation when $x_n \neq 0$. Also since $-\lambda_- \leq c \leq \lambda_+$

$$\frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_n}(x', 0, t) \geq 0.$$

Then by even reflection each w_i is a subsolution to the heat equation with intial condition $w_i(x', x_n, 0) = 0$. Also each w_i will also satisfy the growth estimate (5.2). It follows from the usual proofs of Tychonoff's theorem (or by bounding subsolutions from above by solutions and applying Tychonoff's theorem) that $w_i \equiv 0$, and so $v_0 \equiv c|x_n|$. This is a contradiction to v_0 satisfying (5.1). $\square$

Remark 5.4. In the above proof we actually showed that if u is a solution to (1.1), then there is no point $(x_0', 0, t_0)$ such that

$$\sup_{\partial_p \widetilde{Q}_r(x_0', 0, t_0)} v \geq Cr \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\partial_p \widetilde{Q}_r(x_0', 0, t_0)} v \leq -Cr \tag{5.3}$$

for every $0 < r < r_0$ for some fixed r_0.

As a consequence of Theorem 1.2 we may obtain a uniform separation of the free boundaries based on a compactness argument.

Theorem 5.5. *Let u be a solution to* (1.1) *in Q_1 with*

$$\|u\|_{H^{1,1/2}(Q_1)} \leq C$$

Then there exists $d > 0$ depending on C such that

$$d_p((\Gamma^+ \cap Q_{1/2}), (\Gamma^- \cap Q_{1/2})) \geq d$$

Proof. Suppose by way of contradiction that there exists a sequence of solutions u_k with

$$d_p((\Gamma^+(u_k) \cap Q_{1/2}), (\Gamma^-(u_k) \cap Q_{1/2})) \to 0$$

By Corollary 3.3 we have a subsequence $u_k \to u_0$ with u_0 a solution to (1.1). Furthermore, as a consequence of Corollary 4.4 it is clear that there would exist a point $(x_0, t_0) \in \overline{Q}_{1/2}$ and (x_0, t_0) would be a point satisfying (5.3) which is a contradiction to Remark 5.4. □

Because of the uniform separation of the free boundaries, we are able to transfer known results for solutions of (1.2) to solutions of (1.1). In particular we may state results about the optimal regularity of solutions as well as the regularity of the free boundaries.

Corollary 5.6. *Let u be a solution to* (1.1) *with*

$$\|u\|_{H^{1,1/2}(Q_1)} \leq C$$

Then

$$\|u\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2},\frac{3}{4}}(Q^+_{1/2} \cup Q'_{1/2})} \leq C_1 \tag{5.4}$$

where C_1 is dependent on $C, \lambda_\pm$.

Remark 5.7. $H^{\alpha,\alpha/2}$ with $\alpha > 1$ denotes the parabolic Hölder space as defined in [9] and [6].

Proof. We begin first by defining the coincidence set

$$\Lambda(u) := \{(x', 0, t) \mid u(x', 0, t) = 0\}$$

We now consider a point $(x, t) \in Q_{1/2}$. Let $d = d_p((\Gamma^+ \cap Q_{1/2}), (\Gamma^- \cap Q_{1/2}))$. If the distance from (x, t) to a free boundary in $Q_{1/2}$ is greater than $d/4$ and $(x, t) \notin \Lambda(u)$, then one may use regular interior estimates for solutions to the heat equation to obtain the bound in (5.4) for u in the cylinder $Q_{d/8}(x, t)$. If $(x, t) \in \Lambda(u)$, then if we perform an odd reflection on u across the thin space $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\}$, then the reflected function $\tilde{u}$ will be a solution to the heat equation in the cylinder $Q_{d/4}$, and so again we obtain (5.4) for u in the half cylinder $Q^+_{d/8}(x, t) \cup Q'_{d/8}(x, t)$. If the distance from (x, t) to a free boundary is less than or equal to $d/4$, then either $u \mp \lambda_\pm x_n^+$ is a solution to (1.2) in $Q^+_{d/4}(x, t)$ and we utilize the optimal regularity result in [6] to conclude (5.4) for u in $Q^+_{d/8}(x, t) \cup Q'_{d/8}(x, t)$. Then by a covering argument we may conclude the result. □

The above regularity result is optimal since $\mathrm{Re}(x_{n-1} + ix_n)^{3/2} + \lambda_+ x_n$ is a time-independent solution to (1.1) in $Q_r(0, 0)$ for r sufficiently small and λ_+ sufficiently large. See discussion in Section 1 following Proposition 1.1.

We remark here that it may be possible to use the approach in [2] to obtain a priori $H^{\alpha,\alpha/2}$ estimates with $\alpha < 3/2$. The separation of the free boundaries could then be obtained as a consequence of the $H^{\alpha,\alpha/2}$ regularity. Since this paper focuses on the interaction of the free boundaries, we chose to first prove the separation of the free boundaries. Our approach is relatively short and does not require many technical computations or difficulties.

Because of the separation of the free boundaries, the study of the local properties of the free boundaries is completely reduced to studying the free boundary in the parabolic Signorini problem (1.2). The regularity of the regular set of the free boundary as well as the structure of the singular set for the parabolic Signorini problem was recently studied in [6].

REFERENCES

1. Mark Allen, Erik Lindgren, and Arshak Petrosyan, *The two-phase fractional obstacle problem*, (2012), 27pp., preprint.
2. A. Arkhipova and N. Uraltseva, *Sharp estimates for solutions of a parabolic Signorini problem*, Math. Nachr. **177** (1996), 11–29. MR 1374941 (97a:35084)
3. Pipher Beckner, Kening, *A convexity property of eigenvalues, with applications*, v **v** (v), no. v, v, Unpublished.
4. Luis A. Caffarelli, *A monotonicity formula for heat functions in disjoint domains*, Boundary value problems for partial differential equations and applications, RMA Res. Notes Appl. Math., vol. 29, Masson, Paris, 1993, pp. 53–60. MR 1260438 (95e:35096)
5. Luis A. Caffarelli and Carlos E. Kenig, *Gradient estimates for variable coefficient parabolic equations and singular perturbation problems*, Amer. J. Math. **120** (1998), no. 2, 391–439. MR 1613650 (99b:35081)
6. Donatella Danielli, Nicola Garofalo, Arshak Petrosyan, and Tung To, *Optimal regularity and the free boundary in the parabolic signorini problem*, (2012), preprint.
7. G. Duvaut and J.-L. Lions, *Inequalities in mechanics and physics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976, Translated from the French by C. W. John, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 219.
8. O.A. Ladyženskaja, V. A. Solonnikov, and N. N. Ural'ceva, *Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type*, vol. 23, Amer. Math. Soc., 1988 (Translated from the Russian by S. Smith).
9. Gary M. Lieberman, *Second order parabolic differential equations*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1996. MR 1465184 (98k:35003)
10. N. N. Ural′tseva, *Hölder continuity of gradients of solutions of parabolic equations with boundary conditions of Signorini type*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **280** (1985), no. 3, 563–565. MR 775926 (87b:35025)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47907
E-mail address: `allenma@math.purdue.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47907
E-mail address: `wshi@math.purdue.edu`